arXiv:1406.2362v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 9 Jun 2014

The connection between Superconductors of Type I and II due polarons and Itinerant Antiferromagnetism in weak's coupling regime.

Paulo S. A. Bonfim

June 11, 2014

Universidade Unigranrio, Rua Prof. José de Souza Herdy, 1.160, 25071-202, Duque de caxias, RJ ,Brazil.

Abstract

In the weak regime, we suggest a model where superconductivity types I and II bind assuming an adiabatic hypothesis where the frequency of oscillation of free electrons is much smaller than of polarons coupled to phonons, and an itinerant antiferromagnetism appears. At the end of the article we derive an state's equation which is tested according to generic experimental data.

The discovery of new classes of superconductors has been a constant in recent years[1]. However, the type I and type II superconductors keep the same basic characteristic of its description in BCS model: almost perfect diamagnetic behavior. Under controlled conditions , keeping the temperature mostly below the transition, worth the London equations that are accurate for Type I superconductors but not realize some properties of type II superconductors, especially the penetration of the magnetic field in the high transition temperature of some (especially of cupric oxides and recently the Iron arsenides) [2]. Therefore, it is desirable that any theory that allows for the critical temperature of superconductors of type II, in some limit, reduces to the usual BCS state´s equation. There have been developments in this direction for a perturbation theory in weak coupling, Eliashberg et al [3] , but was abandoned due to the idea that superconductivity of type II have separate origin of type I. Series of recent experiments, especially EPR [4], try to prove set of theories that assume strong coupling and strongly localized nature where the most used techniques consist of Green's functions in appropriate bases (For example helicity) whose solutions are exact [5] by deviating from the perturbative techniques. These approaches are derived from the great success of quantum field theory when applied to low-dimensional systems and in particular Strong Couplings for Heavy Fermions called where there is also large local magnetic influences. The Hubbard Hamiltonian applies very well to this kind of problems especially for Cold Atoms and Phases ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic.

But the same experiments in EPR [4] in compounds of type YBCO also remind us of features which would fit a perturbative approach: possibility of itinerant antiferromagnetism, coexistence of holes, electron and polarons on the same phenomenon. More recently, we observed a type II superconductor where the spatial symmetry was not broken, there was no privileged plane for the superconducting conduction [2].

In this paper we propose a simple model as another of the many mechanisms that compose the type superconductivity II, where the wave S of Cooper's pairs receives boost with tunneling Josephson of free electrons in barriers produced by polarons phenomenologically[6]. Such barriers produce a state of Itinerant Antiferromagnetism in a dynamic electrons$\times$holes. In the case of cupric oxide, holes are produced by oxygen which reduces the copper. Once reduced ion Cu^{+2} suffers an effect: the proximity of the orbitals $3p^6$ and $3d^9$possibly produces hybridization. The íon Cu^{+2}have one of the greatest potential third ionization of the known elements. This hybridization would increase the overall energy of the orbital p and d away from the atom's nucleus, approaching the orbitals of the ions Cu^{+2}neighbors, but with a hole produced by oxygen. And producing the following effects: The inner orbital hybridized form a potential barrier to the free electrons since it would be quite filled, the hole produced simultaneously by oxygen would form a well and a few free electrons would be released. This structure would vibrate

with frequency close to that of Phonons network and be coupled to the same, very close to a polaron. This state would be frozen (adiabatic hypothesis) relative to the free electrons because the oscillation frequency of the polaron would be much smaller than the free electrons ($\omega_P \ll \omega_e$).

Selective doping elements donors increase the number of barriers to a certain limit where excess barriers and reducing electrons available diminish the effect of Josephson tunneling in the state IAF (Itinerant AntiFerromagnetism).Therefore, the polaron electron-hole generates new 'gap' that can be additive to 'gap' BCS, sometimes competing and other reinforcing and increasing its critical temperature.

1 Frozen Phonon x Polaron State - Adiabatic Hipotesis.

How we work in perturbation hypothesis we keep the original BCS Hamiltonian and assuming a structure of barriers is generated by the dynamics electrons×hole where the coupling phonon×polaron produces a structure barriers. The validity of this hypothesis derives from the fact that the oscillation frequency of polarons be much smaller than the free electrons involved: $\omega_P \ll \omega_e$. Soon, though dynamic, the proposed structure is frozen in relation to frequency of free electrons, ie, our model arises from an adiabatic hypothesis. Follows the figure:

Dynamic simple unidimensional example of sucessive Josephson free electron tunneling into hole x hibridizade orbital (that dewar with phonon coupling is a Polaron)



The latest models for cupric oxides adopt the strategy of making the odd dispersion of free electrons of the crystal as a function in momentum space[7], we will adopt the same strategy: $\epsilon_{-k} = -\epsilon_k$. This consideration derives from the fact that the wave function be symmetric BCS for long-range interactions. But locally, the short range of each individual electron wave must be antisymmetric whereas the order parameter that generates the 'gap superconductor: $\left\langle c^\dagger_{\uparrow k} c^\dagger_{\downarrow -k} \right\rangle = \left\langle c^\dagger_k c^\dagger_{-k} \right\rangle \neq 0$, and invariably, $\left\langle c^\dagger_{\downarrow k} c^\dagger_{\uparrow -k} \right\rangle = 0$. Following similar reasoning any dispersion relation derived from global interactions, long-range, will be considered even function in momentum space: $F_{-k} = F_k$.

2 Hamiltonian

With great success Scrieffer & Wolff [8] used a canonical transformation to include second order effects of an exchange. Kondo [9] e Appenbaum [10] ,treated perturbative form of the scattering of electrons by magnetic impurities.The dynamic nature of superconductivity does not seem limited by the low dimensionality of the system, then consider that the superconducting phase is not limited sites as suggested by models developed in recent years [11]. In particular, we will not use a local model sites (Hubbard) and define a Hamiltonian in momentum space.

$$H = \sum_k \epsilon_k c^\dagger_k c_k + \varepsilon_T c^\dagger_T c_T + U \sum_k c^\dagger_k c_k c^\dagger_{-k} c_{-k} +$$

$$+ \sum_k \left[V_{k,T} c^\dagger_k c_T + V^*_{k,T} c^\dagger_T c_K \right] \qquad (1)$$

In this Hamiltonian in particular see how the bound state produced by electron tunneling $\epsilon_T c_T^\dagger c_T$ the structure of the frozen barrier polaron (figure 1) affects the BCS interaction and how the mixing of populations via 'exchange' affects the critical temperature of the superconducting state. The terms mixture $V_{k,T} c_k^\dagger c_T$ are the first order $V \sim V_{k,T} \sim V_{k,T}^*$ we consider very near and we will make canonical transformation in the second order [8] whereas that $V \ll \varepsilon_k + U$ define convergence's range $r = {}^{\Gamma}/_{(\varepsilon_k + U)}$ where $\Gamma = \pi N(\varepsilon_T) AVE$, see how the set of quasi-bound states via tunneling affects the BCS term $U \sum_k c_k^\dagger c_k c_{-k}^\dagger c_{-k}$, just only interested in the V^2 terms.

3 The Canonical transformation

We use the Baker-Hausdorff lemma so that only the terms proportional to V^2 'mix' the terms of sector U of the Hamiltonian. We will eliminate the terms proportional to V:

$$\overline{H} = H_0 + {}^1/_2 \left[\hat{S}, V\right] + {}^1/_{3!} \left[\hat{S}, \left[\hat{S}, V\right]\right] ... \tag{2}$$

We have a simple way for the operator$\hat{S}$ [8] :

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{k'} \frac{V_{k'} n_{-k'} c_T^\dagger c_{k'}}{\epsilon_T - (\epsilon_k + U)} \tag{3}$$

Considering $n_m = c_m^\dagger c_m$ and the usual relations $\left\{c_m^\dagger, c_l\right\} = \delta_{ml}$; $\left\{c_m^\dagger c_l^\dagger\right\} = \{c_m c_l\} = 0$. We will use only the term $\overline{H} = H_0 + {}^1/_2 \left[\hat{S}, V\right]$ the perturbative series, easily found;

$$\overline{H} = \left[\epsilon_T + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2 n_{-k}}{\epsilon_T - (\epsilon_k + U)}\right] n_T +$$

$$+ \sum_k \epsilon_k n_k + \left[U - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2}{\epsilon_T - (\epsilon_k + U)}\right] n_k n_{-k} \tag{4}$$

In the case, $n_T \ll N_k = \sum_k n_k$ incorporated $E_T + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2 n_{-k}}{\epsilon_T - (\epsilon_k + U)} \sim E_T$ in $\sum_k \epsilon_k n_k$. We got to the effective Hamiltonian, which reversed ϵ_T with ϵ_k.

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_k \left[\epsilon_k n_k + \left(U + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2}{\epsilon_k + (U - \epsilon_T)}\right) n_k n_{-k}\right] \tag{5}$$

According to our previous considerations on two distinct populations: influence of fermionic about 'odd' dispersion ϵ_k 'local, short-range' and Bosonic (Copper's pairs) about the effects of Coulomb and tunneling of the quasi-bound states of the potential of the polaron binding.

4 Successive tunneling and the order parameter particle × hole.

We define an order parameter $\triangle = \left\langle c_k^\dagger c_{-k} \right\rangle$, Hole × particle, consistent with our model, we will introduce later phonons in the 'gap' equation with Debye energy's cut-offs.

We can consider that$\triangle \neq 0$. We rewrite (5) in terms of this parameter. Plus, as we consider the energy $\epsilon_T \ll U$. Locally, the denominator of the term $\frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2}{\epsilon_k + (U - \epsilon_T)}$ slightly affects the interaction BCS U . Thus we can group the term $U + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{V_k^2}{\epsilon_k + (U - \epsilon_T)} = \triangle_{NL}$, (return later to term), almost constant for times very close around the time of Fermi $k \sim k_F$ using the BCS weak coupling hypothesis. Manipulating (5) and considering the order parameter:

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_k \left[\epsilon_k c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} c_k^\dagger c_k (\hat{1} - c_{-k} c_{-k}^\dagger)\right] =$$

$$= \sum_k \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} c_k^\dagger c_{-k} c_{-k}^\dagger c_k\right] \tag{6}$$

In our model we adopt the order parameter electron×hole$\left\langle c_k^\dagger c_{-k} \right\rangle \neq 0$, of (6) we find:

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_k \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} \triangle c_{-k}^\dagger c_k \right] \tag{7}$$

Now we use the assumption of the 'quasi bound states' QBS to manipulate summations and use the parity of the dispersions around k_{Fermi}, We impose $k_{Fermi} = 0$:

$$\sum_k = \sum_{-k} + \sum_{+k} \tag{8}$$

The first summation on the right is opposite to the second sum to the right times. This is possible only with the hypothesis of QBS state, which transforms the equation (7) , as follows:

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_k \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} \triangle c_{-k}^\dagger c_k \right] +$$

$$+ \sum_{-k} \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} \triangle c_{-k}^\dagger c_k \right] \tag{9}$$

To use our approach parity of dispersions local and non-local we unified de summation (8) around the Fermi energy, Taking the conversion $k \to -k$ in the sector $\sum_{-k}$ of equation (9) simultaneously embracing $\triangle \sim \triangle^*$, found :

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_k \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} \triangle c_{-k}^\dagger c_k \right] +$$

$$+ \sum_k \left[(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_{-k}) c_{-k}^\dagger c_{-k} + \triangle_{NL} \triangle^* c_k^\dagger c_{-k} \right] =$$

$$= \sum_0^k [(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + \triangle_{NL} \triangle c_{-k}^\dagger c_k +$$

$$+ (\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_{-k}) c_{-k}^\dagger c_{-k} + \triangle_{NL} \triangle^* c_k^\dagger c_{-k}]$$

Around the Fermi energy, assuming $k_{Fermi} = 0$, with $\epsilon_{-k} = -\epsilon_k$ for dispersions of free electrons (local influences) and $F_{-k} = F_k$ for Non local and global influences, we arrive at the same Hamiltonian of ITINERANT ANTIFERROMAGNETISM [12]:

$$H_{EFF} = \sum_0^k [(\triangle_{NL} + \epsilon_k) c_k^\dagger c_k + (\triangle_{NL} - \epsilon_k) c_{-k}^\dagger c_{-k} +$$

$$+ \triangle_{NL} \triangle \left(c_{-k}^\dagger c_k + c_k^\dagger c_{-k} \right)] \tag{10}$$

5 Itinerant Antiferromagnetism, Bogoluibov Transform and Gap equation.

The goal of our model is to link the particle x hole dynamics , with phonon x polaron and itinerant antiferromagnetism. Let's perform a transformation Bogoluibov and then retrieve $\triangle_{NL}$ with $\theta = \theta_k$:

$$\begin{cases} c_k^\dagger = A_k^\dagger sen\theta - A_{-k}^\dagger cos\theta \\ c_k = A_k sen\theta - A_{-k} cos\theta \\ c_{-k}^\dagger = A_{-k}^\dagger sen\theta + A_k^\dagger cos\theta \\ c_{-k} = A_{-k} sen\theta + A_k cos\theta \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

The rotation allows us to diagonalize (10), defining new base: $u_k = sen\theta$ e $v_k = cos\theta$, manipulating the sums as in (8) using the hypothesis QBS:

$$H_{EFF}^{D} = \sum_{k} \left(\triangle_{NL} - \epsilon_k cos2\theta - \triangle_{NL}.\triangle sen2\theta \right) A_k^{\dagger} A_k \tag{12}$$

Using the free energy HelmHoltz $F = \left\langle H_{EFF}^{D} \right\rangle - TS$, taking its minimum at the new base $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta_k} = \frac{\partial \left\langle H_{EFF}^{D} \right\rangle}{\partial \theta_k} = 2\epsilon_k sen2\theta_k - 2\triangle sen2\theta_k$, and subjecting (12) to a thermal bath $(1-2f_k)$ being $f_k = \frac{1}{e^{\epsilon/kT}+1}$, we get the equation of 'Gap' to our system:

$$\epsilon_k tg2\theta_k = \triangle_{NL}.\triangle \tag{13}$$

Fixing the free part and taking the thermal average $\triangle_{NL} = U + \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \frac{V_k^2}{\epsilon_k + (U - \epsilon_T)}$: setting usually via hypothesis BCS: $tg2\theta_k = \frac{\triangle_k}{\epsilon_k}$

$$\triangle_k = \sum_{k'} \left(U + \frac{1}{2} \frac{V^2}{\epsilon_{k'} + (U - \epsilon_T)} \right) .\triangle.(1 - 2f_{k'}) \tag{14}$$

In the above equation so that there is self-consistent solution, the right fixes the left side that gets its share 'free' fixed according to BCS hypothesis: $tg2\theta_k = \frac{\triangle_k}{\epsilon_k}$. Here we assume, analogous to the BCS model, which U and V_k are smooth functions on the closed Fermi energy range. So we can solve (14) an explicit form is required for the order parameter$\triangle$. The physical sense of the parameter defines its shape as a function of k, using as a reference text De Gennes [13] assume as a solution to the Josephson tunneling: $E(k) = E_0 + Jcosk \rightarrow E(\theta_k) = E_0 + Jcos2\theta_k$ in our model. Adapting our basic and simple form of a function $\theta_k = k$. The wave packet in momentum space is obtained directly from $\frac{\partial E(\theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k} = -2Jsen2\theta_k$, ie, the antiferromagnetic order parameter has its origin bound states formed by tunneling:

$$\triangle = \left\langle c_k^{\dagger} c_{-k} \right\rangle = \frac{\partial E(\theta_k)}{\partial \theta_k} = -2Jsen2\theta_k \tag{15}$$

Thus we can rewrite the equation of 'Gap':

$$\triangle_k = -2J.\sum_{k'} \left(U + \frac{1}{2} \frac{V^2}{\epsilon_{k'} + (U - \epsilon_T)} \right) .sen2\theta_k.(1 - 2f_{k'}) \tag{16}$$

But according to BCS hypothesis: $sen2\theta_k = \frac{\triangle_k}{\sqrt{\epsilon_k^2 + \triangle_k^2}}$:

$$\triangle_k = -2J.\sum_{k'} \left(U + \frac{1}{2} \frac{V^2}{\epsilon_{k'} + (U - \epsilon_T)} \right) .\frac{\triangle_k}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{k'}^2 + \triangle_k^2}}.(1 - 2f_{k'}) \tag{17}$$

Note that with $V \rightarrow 0$, equation (17) returns to the 'Gap' original BCS equation. At this point we use $(1 - 2f_{k'}) \rightarrow tgh\left(\frac{\epsilon}{kT}\right)$. In this model without the introduction of phonons theres no physical sense. Originally BCS theory introduces phonons with a 'cut-off' in the continuous limit in the energy space is the 'Debye temperature': θ_D. We adopt the ansatz that the Debye temperature assumes$\sim 4 \times T_c$, ie, the factor $tgh\left(\frac{\epsilon}{kT}\right) \rightarrow 1$, for $k\theta_D > kT$, as an asymptotic limit. Therefore, for $\epsilon_T \sim cte$, and $\triangle_k \sim cte$, turning to energy space in continuous limit, (17) is in the form:

$$1 = -2JN \left[U \int_{kT_c}^{k\theta_D} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon} + \frac{V^2}{2} \int_{kT_c}^{k\theta_D} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon^2} \right] .tgh\left(\frac{\epsilon}{kT_c} \right) \tag{18}$$

In the asymptotic limit we propose, and N being the density of states:

$$1 = -2JN \left[U \int_{kT_c}^{k\theta_D} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon} + \frac{V^2}{2} \int_{kT_c}^{k\theta_D} \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon^2} \right] \tag{19}$$

Using $J_0 = 2J$, we find:

$$1 = J_0 \left[NU.ln\left(\frac{T_c}{\theta_D} \right) + \frac{NV^2}{2k} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_D} - \frac{1}{T_c} \right) \right] \tag{20}$$

Assuming $U < 0$.

6 Conclusions and future developments.

The equation of state (20) in the limit $V \to 0$ and with $J \to 1$ recovers the original BCS equation considering $U < 0$. We determined an equation of state which returns the type I superconductivity when the second-order effects due to the polaron disappears. The effect is very similar to the Jahn-Teller effect. Relationship is established between the itinerant antiferromagnetism and superconductivity of type II.

To test the equation we calculate some experimental values [14]. In particular the YBCuO family. The values we used were: $T_c \sim 100\,K$; Debye Temperature $\theta_D \sim 410\,K$ (watching the most massive and abundant ion Cu) ; $NU \sim -0.66$; $J_0 \sim 1.14$; $K_B = 8.617 \times 10^{-5} eV/K$ with $\frac{1}{2K} \sim 5802$. And we find $NV^2 \sim 0,00123$.

In our little test, the ratio between the BCS interaction and second-order effect due to tunneling of electrons through structure of polarons is $\frac{U}{V^2} \sim 550$,ie, an order of magnitude10^3.

For future developments, we can study $U(\omega)$ e $V(\omega)$ like unique spatial configurations functions of ions and polarons, respectively.

References

[1] BERG, Erez; FRADKIN, Eduardo; KIVELSON, Steven A. Theory of the striped superconductor. Physical Review B, v. 79, n. 6, p. 064515, 2009.

[2] YUAN, H. Q. et al. Nearly isotropic superconductivity in (Ba, K) Fe2As2. Nature, v. 457, n. 7229, p. 565-568, 2009.

[3] ELIASHBERG, G. M. Interactions between electrons and lattice vibrations in a superconductor. Sov. Phys.-JETP (Engl. Transl.);(United States), v. 11, n. 3, 1960.

[4] BUSSMANN-HOLDER, A.; KELLER, H. Polaron formation as origin of unconventional isotope effects in cuprate superconductors. The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems, v. 44, n. 4, p. 487-490, 2005.

[5] BARCI, Daniel G.; BONFIM, Paulo S.A. , SUPERCONDUCTIVITY NEAR POMERANCHUK INSTABILITIES IN THE SPIN CHANNEL , Mod. Phys. Lett. B 27, 1350102 (2013).

[6] ANDREEV, A. F. Thermal conductivity of the intermediate state of superconductors. Zh. Eksperim. i Teor. Fiz., v. 46, 1964.

[7] PADILHA, Igor T.; CONTINENTINO, Mucio A. Pressure induced FFLO instability in multi-band superconductors. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, v. 21, n. 9, p. 095603, 2009.

[8] SCHRIEFFER, J. R.; WOLFF, P. A. Relation between the anderson and kondo hamiltonians. Physical Review, v. 149, p. 491-492, 1966.

[9] KONDO, Jun. Resistance minimum in dilute magnetic alloys. Progress of theoretical physics, v. 32, n. 1, p. 37-49, 1964.

[10] APPELBAUM, Joel A.; KONDO, Jun. Ground-State and Low-Temperature Properties of Paramagnetic Impurities in Metals. Physical Review Letters, v. 19, n. 16, p. 906-908, 1967.

[11] TRUGMAN, S. A. Interaction of holes in a Hubbard antiferromagnet and high-temperature superconductivity. Physical Review B, v. 37, n. 4, p. 1597, 1988.

[12] MORIYA, Tôru; TAKIMOTO, Tetsuya. Anomalous properties around magnetic instability in heavy electron systems. Journal of the Physical Society of Japan, v. 64, n. 3, p. 960-969, 1995

[13] GENNES, P. de. Superconductivity of metals and alloys. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1989.

[14] POOLE, Charles P. Jr. Handbook of Superconductivity. San Diego: Academic Press, 2000.